

**REMARKS**

**Introduction**

Claims 1-8 were pending. Claims 1 and 6 are independent, and have been amended herein.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,775,783 (Trostle).

Trostle describes a system, method and apparatus for limiting access by a user to a networked application or service. Access to network security credentials that allow a user to authenticate to application servers is accomplished by storing the user's credentials in memory that is only accessible by a local security authority (LSA). A secret associated with each credential is stored in a secret file which is accessible only by the associated user. When this secret is passed to the LSA by the user, the LSA passes back a handle to the appropriate credential, which the user can later use to obtain authentication information through the LSA. Thus, to access a credential, a user must conform with the file system access control to first access the secret, then conform with the LSA access control to obtain the credential handle.

In contrast to the method described by Trostle, with the presently claimed invention, the requester is one step removed from having access to the secret credentials. Amended claims 1 and 6 of the present application recite a method and a system configured to execute steps of receiving a request to access a data store from a process initiated by a requester on a remote server; providing the store with an exclusive user id; initiating a second process responsive to the store access request, the second process being accessible by the first process but inaccessible to the requester; changing a context of the second process to the user id of the store; communicating

between the second process and the store via private communications channels; and the first process obtaining data responsive to the store access request.

Nowhere in Trostle is it described or taught that a second process that is responsive to the store access request is accessible by the first process but inaccessible to the requester. According to the Examiner, the user process in Trostle that is responsive to a store access request can be found in column 4, lines 7-9, which is the user logon process. This process is accessible and can communicate with both the user (requester) and the process (the LSA) which administers access to the secret credentials of Trostle. Referring to column 4, lines 64-67 of Trostle, “because the credentials reside in the LSA which operates by separate processes, access to the credentials is limited to processes that first interact with the LSA itself.” These credentials are accessible to the requester in the login program, which uses the login and password information that passes back as secret credentials from the LSA.

In contrast, the present claimed invention has the user initiating a first process from a remote server, wherein this process can communicate with a second process for initiating a data request. The second process, however, as stated by the Examiner, has the equivalent of the secret credentials, which the Examiner interprets as the exclusive user id for accessing the data store. This user id, which is applied to the data store and the second process, is known only by the second process, and is not passed back to the first process or the requester. What is passed back to the requestor is only the requested data. Also, no secret credentials, such as a password, is passed back to the requester. There is communication of credentials that are different from the exclusive userid that are passed between the first and second processes, but never back to the requester on the remote server.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Trostle does not disclose or teach the invention recited by amended claims 1 and 6 of the present application. Claims 2-5 ultimately

depend from claim 1, and claims 7 and 8 ultimately depend from claim 6. Since claims 1 and 6 have been shown to be patentable, the claims depending therefrom are likewise deemed to be patentable, for at least the reasons described above with respect to the patentability of claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-8.

Thus, applicants submit that each of the claims of the present application are patentable over each of the references of record, either taken alone, or in any proposed hypothetical combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment. If, however, any fees are deemed necessary for this Amendment to be entered and considered by the Examiner, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-1358. Applicant's undersigned patent agent may be reached by telephone at (973) 597-2500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/17/07

  
Raymond G. Cappo  
Patent Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 53,836

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR  
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068